

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated July 31, 2006, claims 1-5, 8-10, 17, 19-22, 26-30, 33-35, 42, 44, 45, 47, and 51-53 were rejected, and claims 6, 7, 11-16, 18, 23-25, 31, 32, 36-41, 43, 46, and 48-50 were objected to.

Claims 1, 26, 51, 52, and 53 are amended herein in order to more distinctively recite inherent aspects of the claimed invention, and claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 10, 17, 19-22, 26-30, 35, 42, 44, 45, 47, and 51-53 were rejected as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,914,956 ("Williams"). This rejection is now traversed in light of the amended claims.

Independent claims 1, 26, 51, 52, and 53 are amended herein to variously recite:

"...determining whether entries of the ... connection table are active, the entries of the connection table being active if the entries have been altered or just created since a previous transfer of data;

... transferring data from active entries of the connection table to memory..."

Thus, the claimed inventions of claims 1, 26, 51, 52, and 53 determine that certain entries of the connection table are active if they have been altered or just created since a previous transfer or data, and only transfer such active entries to the memory for analysis by

the application, thereby reducing the number of entries that have to be transferred to the memory.

Williams does not disclose determining that certain entries of the connection table are active if they have been altered or just created since a previous transfer of data, and only transferring such active entries to the memory for analysis by the application, which the Examiner admits in paragraph 5 of the office action by indicating that claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 contain allowable subject matter. Please note that the limitation of “...entries of the connection table being active if the entries have been altered or just created since a previous transfer of data...” was incorporated to claims 1, 26, 51, 52, and 53 from claims 6, 7, 31, 32, which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 26, 51, 52, and 53 are patentably distinct from Williams.

Dependent claims 2-5, 10, 17, 19-22, 27-30, 35, 42, 44, 45, and 47 are dependent directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 26, and thus should also be patentably distinct from Williams for at least the same reasons as explained above with respect to claims 1 and 26.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 8, 9, 33, and 34 were rejected as being obvious over US Patent No. 5,914,956 (“Williams”) in view of US Patent No. 6,195,352 (“Cushman”). This rejection is now traversed in light of the amended claims.

Claims 8, 9, 33, and 34 are dependent from independent claim 1 or 26. As explained above, Williams does not disclose or suggest determining that certain entries of the connection table are active if they have been altered or just created since a previous transfer

or data, and only transferring such active entries to the memory for analysis by the application as variously recited in claims 1 and 26, which the Examiner admits in paragraph 5 of the office action by indicating that claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 contain allowable subject matter.

In addition, Cushman also fails to disclose or suggest determining that certain entries of the connection table are active if they have been altered or just created since a previous transfer or data, and only transferring such active entries to the memory for analysis by the application as variously recited in claims 1 and 26, which the Examiner admits in paragraph 5 of the office action by indicating that claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 contain allowable subject matter. Cushman was relied upon in the Office Action merely for the disclosure of statistical information, but does not disclose or suggest that certain entries of the ATM connection table are active if they have been altered or just created since a previous transfer or data, for transfer of the entries to memory for analysis.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See MPEP §2143.03. The deficient disclosures of Williams and Cushman preclude establishing a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness of independent claims 1 and 26 (and their dependent claims 6, 7, 31, and 32) can be made. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 are patentably distinct from Williams and Cushman.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 6, 7, 11-16, 18, 23-25, 31, 32, 36-41, 43, 46, and 48-50 as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable

if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As explained above, the limitations of claims 6 and 7 and claims 31 and 32, which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter, were combined and added to the independent claims 1 and 26, respectively. In addition, claims 11-16, 18, 23-25, 36-41, 43, 46, and 48-50 are dependent directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 26, as amended to include the limitations of claims 6 and 7 and claims 31 and 32. Claims 6, 7, 31, and 32 have been canceled herein.

Thus, claims 11-16, 18, 23-25, 36-41, 43, 46, and 48-50 should now be allowable and the objection to these claims is overcome.

Conclusion

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-5, 8-30, 33-53 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 25, 2006

By: /Jae Won Song/
Jae Won Song, Reg. No. 59,070
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7164
Fax: (650) 938-5200